REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this Response, an Office Action was mailed August 7, 2009.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-9, 11-21, 23-25, 28-31, 33, 35-41, 43-49, 51, 53-66, 69-78, 80-90, 92-93, and 95-113 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for having insufficient antecedence for the recited limitation "each other," and rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-21, 23-25, 29-30, 33, 35-37, 39-41, 51, 53-55, 69-74, 76-78, 92-93, and 95-113 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2002/0012329 to Atkinson et al. (hereafter Atkinson) in view of "A Comparison of Service Discovery Protocols and Implementation of the Service Location Protocol" (hereafter ACSDPI).

In this Response, Applicant amends claims 1, 3, 6-9, 9, 11, 14-17, 20, 23, 28-31, 33, 35, 36, 38, 53, 55, 63, 65, 66, 69-78, 80-88, 93, 101, 102, 107, 108, and 113.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 12, 14-21, 23-25, 28-31, 33, 35-41, 43-49, 51, 53-66, 69-78, 80-90, 92-93, and 95-113 stand in the application. Claims 1, 33, 63, 65, 66, 78, 102, and 108 are in independent form. Reconsideration is requested. In

addition to the above amendments, the Applicant makes the following remarks regarding individual issues:

THE APPLICANT'S TIME TO RESPOND

The last Office Action was mailed on August 7, 2009. The three-month initial deadline for responding without having to pay a penalty fee ended on November 7, 2009. The Applicant hereby encloses a one-month small entity extension fee. The initial deadline is thus extended to December 7, 2009.

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone conversation of December 4, 2009 and reminds Examiner to correct the Office Action Summary including erroneously checked boxes indicating that the action is both final and non-final. Applicant confirmed with Examiner that the Office Action mailed August 7, 2009 was non-final.

SUPPORT FOR CLAIMS FROM PROVISIONAL APPLICATION 60/245,101

Applicant asserts that each claim limitation in the currently pending claims is supported by the provisional application 60/245,101 filed on November 1, 2000. As requested by the Examiner, the table below maps each claim limitation to the provisional application.

Priority Table	
Claim Limitation(s)	**Example(s) of Support in 60/245,101**
Information apparatus	(Page 6, line 30-35), (Page 8, line 31-35), (Page 9, line 3-4), (Page 23, line 11-13), Fig. 1 (100)
Digital content	(Page 6, line 28-30)
Interface for interacting with	(Page 9, line 4-8), (Page 38, line 5-8), (Page 38,

a user	line 16-19)
Interface including touch sensitive screen or push button	(Page 9, line 4-8), (Page 38, line 16-19) Fig 8 A, B, C, D, E, F, G
Output management software in information apparatus	(Page 7, line 1-2), (Page 7, line 4-7), (Page 10, line 15-19), (Page 11, line 5-6), (Page 27, line 18-19) Fig 3A (308), Fig 3B, Fig 3C (318).
Application software in information apparatus	(Page 9, line 12-15), (Page 9, line 20-23), (Page 9, line 25-26) Fig 3A (302,304,306), Fig 3B, Fig 3C(322,324,326)
Application Software includes e-mail, messaging, Internet browsing, image acquisition	(Page 9, line 20-23), (Page 9, line 25-26) Fig 3A, 3B, 3C, Fig 8 A, 8B, 8C, 8D
Processing unit	(Page 9, line 3-4), (Page 9, line 28-29)
Memory unit	(Page 9, line 3-4), (Page 6, line 30-35)
Wireless communication unit	(Page 9, line 25), (Page 19, line 33), (Page 20, line 1-2), (Page 20, line 9-11), (Page 22, line 1-3), Fig1 (130), Fig 2A, Fig 2B
Radio Frequency	(Page 20, line 10-12), (Page 20, line 19-21), (Page 20, line 25-28), (Page 20, line 32-33), (Page 21, line 1-2). Fig 2A
Output device	(Page 17, line 9-11), (Page 17, line 19-22), (Page 7, line 7-8), (Page 26, line 29-33), (Page 33, line 22-24), Fig 1
Printer	(Page 17, line 11-12)
Display or projection device	(Page 17, line 14-16)
Audio device	(Page 17, line 17-19)
Receiving an indication from user over the interface for output	(Page 8, line 5), (Page 27, line 3-9), Fig 5 (500)
Application software communicating with output management software	(Page 22, line 23-27), (Page 23, line 29-33), Fig 3A, Fig 3B, Fig 3C

Passing content from application software to output management software	(Page 10, line 29-31, passed), (Page 22, line 19-21), (Page 22 , line 28-33), (Page 23, line 1-2), Fig 3A, Fig 3B, Fig 3C
Passing content means including API's or object models or component models	(Page 22, line 23-27), (Page 23, line 29-33), Fig 3A, Fig 3B, Fig 3C
Wireless Searching	(Page 27, line 15-16, searches), Fig 5 (502), Fig 6
Wireless discovering	(Page 8, line 6, discovery), (Page 11, line 10-13), Fig 5 (502), Fig 6
Receive over wireless communication attributes for selecting a device	(Page 13, line 12-17), (Page 31, line 13-14), Fig 5 (504), Fig 6 (600)
Attributes for selecting includes, identity, type, model, price, quality of service, and availability	(Page 34, line 7-8, identified), (Page 13, line 12-17, identification), (Page 30, line 18, type), (Page 34, line 19-28), (Page 31, line 18-19), Fig 5 (504), Fig 6.
Selecting a device	(Page 8, line 8-10), (Page 34, line 12-14), (Page 34, line 33), (Page 35, line 1), (Page 39, line 11-12). Fig 6 (602)
Establish direct wireless connection to the selected output device	(Page 12, line 30-33, directly), (Page 16, line 33-34), (Page 19, line 28-31). Fig 4B, 4C, 4E
Direct wireless connection not including an external server in between…	(Page 7, line 10-11), (Page 7, line 14-17), (Page 12, line 10-12), (Page 12, line 16-24). (Page 24, line 28-33), (Page 25, line 1-8), Fig 4B, 4C, 4E
Receiving over wireless connection components or information for generating output data	(Page 7, line 21-22), (Page 11, line 13-18), (Page 14, line 31-33), (Page 15, line 3-9), (Page 15, line 25-27), (Page 31, line 26-30). Fig 5(514), Fig 5 (516), Fig 8D
Component for generating output data includes data, code, object, parameters,	(Page 31, line 26-30), (Page 14, line 31-33), (Page 15, line 3-9), (Page 15, line 16-17, “part” of an application)

driver, software, user interface, executable	
The information or components being necessary for generating an accurate output data	(Page 7, line 23-26, necessary), (Page 7, line 26-29, in order to), (Page 11, line 19-22, necessary).
Output data	(Page 7, line 31-33), (Page 8, line 1-2), Fig 7 (518)
Generating an output data from the digital content	(Page 36, line 4, generated), (Page 11, line 22-28), (Page 32, line 20-21, convert), (Page 36, line 1-18, generate)., Fig 7 (700), Fig 5 (518)
Generating output data using at least partly the information or components received…	(Page 7, line 26-29, generate, transmit), (Page 8, line 15-16), (Page 2, line 14-17), (Page 35, line 29-33)
Sending the output data over the wireless communication connection to the output device	(Page 7, line 26-29, transmit) (Page 11, line 29-31, send), (Page 35, line 29-33, transmit), Fig 8F
Installing and or executing received component(s)	(Page 12, line 30-33) (Page 8, line 13-14) (Page 15, line 32-33) (Page 14, line 1-2) (Page 15, line 12)
Driving the output device with information apparatus over wireless connection	(Page 14, line 28-32), (Page 15, line 32-35)
Authentication	(Page 13, line 18-22), (Page 29 , line 4-12), (Page 35, line 6-14), (Page 39, line 1-9), Fig 6 (604)
Input authentication key	(Page 35, line 6-14), (Page 39, line 1-9)
Payment	(Page 13, line 23), (Page 33, line 28-33)
Delete component after output	(Page 32 , line 10-13), (Page 32, line 14-18)

THE SECTION 112 REJECTION

Applicant has herein amended independent claims 1, 33, 63, 65, 66, 78, 102, and 108 to remove the limitation "each other" in all occurrences. Applicant accordingly requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

THE SECTION 103(A) OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-21, 23-25, 29-30, 33, 35-37, 39-41, 51, 53-55, 69-74, 76-78, 92-93, and 95-113 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Atkinson in view of ACSDPI. For at least the following reasons, the Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection. More specifically, Applicant has articulated their response as an element-by-element discussion of the multiple elements Applicant asserts are patentable over Atkinson in view of ACSDPI.

The standard under Section 103 is whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. In re O'Farrell, 7 USPQ2d 1673, 1680 (Fed. Cir. 1988). "[A] patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art." KSR Int'l v. Teleflex, Inc., 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1742, 167 L.Ed.2d 705 (2007). The Examiner bears the initial burden in the case of Section 103(a) obviousness rejection which requires the Examiner to put forward evidence that the invention as a whole would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. In re Piasecki, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472 (Fed. Cir. 1984), citing In re Warner, 379 F.2d 1011, 1016 (CCPA 1967). Moreover, the Examiner

cannot rely on the applicant's disclosure in any way in making this prima facie case. MPEP 2143. The foundational facts for the prima facie case of obviousness are: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the difference between the prior art and the claimed invention; and (3) the level of ordinary skill in the art. Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. at 17-18; Miles Lab., Inc. v. Shandon Inc., 27 USPQ2d 1123, 1128 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Moreover, objective indicia such as commercial success and long felt need are relevant to the determination of obviousness. Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp., 218 USPQ 231, 236 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Each obviousness determination rests on its own facts. In re Durden, 226 USPQ 359, 361 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Where the Examiner relies on a single prior art reference for an obviousness rejection, which does not describe every limitation of the claim, the Examiner must demonstrate how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the reference to achieve the invention without the benefit of hindsight, just as with a combination of references.

The Federal Circuit has made clear that under KSR, the examiner must make "some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." Innogenetics, N.V. v. Abbott Laboratories, 512 F.3d 1363, 1373, 85 USPQ2nd 1641, 1647-48 (Fed. Cir. 2008). The examiner must explain "how or why a person ordinarily skilled in the art would have found the claims of the …patent obvious in light of some combination of those [prior art] references." Innogenetcis, 512 F.3d 16 1373. Similarly, the court held after KSR, the prior art must have narrowed down the number of potential solutions before

an option is deemed "obvious to try"—it is not sufficient if the prior art discloses a broad selection of options, any one of which could have been selected as a basis for further investigation. Takeda Chemical Industries, Ltd. v. Alphapharm Pty., Ltd., 492 F.3d 1350, 1359, 82 USPQ2d 1169, 1176 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

Although the Supreme Court rejected rigid application of the "suggestion, motivation, teaching test" applied by courts in the past, it can still be a useful starting point for evaluation and to prevent hindsight analysis, so long as it is not applied rigidly and the evaluator maintains the framework of the analysis laid down in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1 (1966). KSR, 127 S.Ct. at 1242. The requirement to show a teaching or suggestion to combine prior art references to achieve the claimed invention is critical to preventing hindsight-based obviousness analysis. In re Dembiczak, 175 F.3d 994, 50 U.S.P.Q.2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1999), *abrogated on other grounds by* In re Gartside, 203 F.3d 1305, 53 U.S.P.Q.2d 1769 (Fed. Cir. 2000). "Close adherence to this methodology is especially important in the case of less technologically complex inventions, where the very ease with which the invention can be understood may prompt one to 'fall victim to the insidious effect of a hindsight syndrome wherein that which only the inventor taught is used against its teacher." Id at 999 (quoting W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1983). "[T]he showing must be clear and particular." Id. Moreover, "It is impermissible within the framework of section 103 to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one

skilled in the art." Bausch & Lomb, Inc. v. Barnes-Hind/Hydrocurve, Inc., 230 USPQ 416 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

1. Atkinson

As a preliminary matter, and as they previously noted, Applicant asserts that Atkinson was filed May 4, 2001, which is after the November 1, 2000 filing date of U.S. Prov. Pat. App. Serial No. 60/245,101 to which the present application claims benefit under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e). Atkinson is prior art to the present application only if subject matter relied upon by the Examiner in the rejection has an effective filing date earlier than November 1, 2000.

In response, the Examiner referred to the following provisional applications of Atkinson (hereafter "Atkinson provisionals") as the provisional patent applications that are applicable:

> Provisional Application Ser. No. 60/224,701, filed Aug. 11, 2000;
> Provisional Application 60/227,878, filed Aug. 25, 2000;
> Provisional Application 60/243,654, Oct. 26, 2000;
> Provisional Application Ser. No. 60/208,967, filed Jun. 2, 2000;
> Provisional Application Ser. No. 60/220,047, filed Jul. 21, 2000;

However in the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a), the Examiner failed to show any teaching or suggestion for each limitation recited in the claims in the applicable Atkinson provisionals. Instead, the Examiner cites only the Atkinson application filed on May 4, 2001, namely Paragraph [0101] (printer, characteristic, profile), Paragraph [0102] (choose, driver, fully formatted, website, attribute, color, phone), and Paragraph [0060] (pin), etc., as the basis for his rejection.

Applicant is unable to find support in the above listed Atkinson provisionals for at least paragraphs [0101], [0102], and [0060] in Atkinson's patent application filed on May 4, 2001. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the Examiner's rejection under § 103 is improper. It would NOT have been obvious at the time of the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Atkinson (namely, at least paragraphs [0101], [0102], and [0066]) with ANYTHING because at least those cited portions of Atkinson would not available at the time of the invention. To the contrary, at the time Atkinson filed his application (2002/0012329), it would have been obvious at the time for Atkinson to incorporate the teachings of the Applicant's provisional application 60/245,101 to support at least paragraphs [0101], [0102], and [0060]. Applicant therefore requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

2. ACSDPI

"A Comparison of Service Discovery Protocols and Implementation of the Service Location Protocol" is paper published by Christian Bettstetter on September 13-15, 2000. A copy of the paper can be downloaded at Christian Bettstetter's website. Applicant notes that the page number(s) cited by the Examiner in ACSDPI do not correspond to the page number(a) in the copy of the document downloaded from Christian Bettstetter's website. For example, page 1 of the paper in Bettstetter's website begins on page 5 in the Examiner's copy. For convenience, Applicant will use the Examiner's copy in this response.

Applicant notes that the Examiner cites to the ACSDPI reference location by using only "ONE" word in a paragraph. It is unclear to one of ordinary skill

what, where, and how the "ONE" word describes each limitation recited in the claim, especially when that one word cannot be found in the cited paragraph or even in the entire reference. Applicant would greatly appreciate if the Examiner would list the line number(s) to which he refers so that Applicant may locate the passage and properly respond.

3. Wireless Data Output

In ACSDPI, Bettstetter describes and compares network service discovery protocols that includes SLP, Jini, Salutation, and UPnP (see table 1 page 6).

ACSDPI describes that SLP, Jini, Salutation, and UPnP are network service discovery protocols and not a wireless protocol ("table 1: comparison of service discovery protocol). SLP, Jini, Salutation, and UPnP are not applicable to the art of "a wireless data output method for outputting at one or more wireless output devices digital content accessed from a wireless mobile information apparatus" as recited in claim 1.

Following ACSDPI, one skilled in the art will not look into service discovery network protocol, namely SLP, Jini, Salutation, and UPnP to implement each and every step in the subject matter of "a wireless data output" as recited in each independent claim. ACSDPI emphasizes Bluetooth as a new short range wireless transmission technology. ACSDPI does not list Bluetooth in the same category together with other network protocols (SLP, Jini, Salutation, and UPnP, shown in table 1, page 6). Applicant notes that SLP, Jini, Salutation, and UPnP are not applicable to "wireless data output" recited in each independent claim.

Nevertheless, each independent claim has each been amended to emphasize the numerous distinctions over the cited references as follows.

4. Output Management Software

Applicant has herein amended claim 1 to recite "the wireless mobile information apparatus including an interface for interacting with a user, one or more application software for providing functionalities to the wireless mobile information apparatus, an output management software for output of digital content from the wireless mobile information apparatus to a wireless output device, and a wireless communication unit for wireless communication with the one or more wireless output devices."

Applicant asserts that neither Atkinson nor ACSDPI teach or describe for example the limitation of "an output management software for output of digital content from the wireless mobile information apparatus to a wireless output device."

Applicant has herein amended independent claim 66 to include at least an analogous limitation as recited by claim 1.

5. Passing content from application software to the output management software

Applicant has herein amended claim 1 to recite "passing at the wireless mobile information apparatus at least part of digital content from the one or more application software to the output management software for wireless output."

Applicant asserts that neither Atkinson nor ACSDPI teach or describe anything akin to "passing at the wireless mobile information apparatus at least part of digital content from the one or more application software to the output management software for wireless output."

Applicant has herein amended independent claim 66 to include at least an analogous limitation as recited by claim 1.

6. Interface

Applicant has herein amended claim 33 to recite "the wireless mobile information apparatus including at least a touch sensitive screen interface for interacting with a user."

Applicant asserts that neither Atkinson nor ACSDPI teach or describe "the wireless mobile information apparatus including at least a touch sensitive screen interface for interacting with a user."

7. Receiving over the interface

Applicant has herein amended claim 33 to recite "receiving over the interface from the user at least an indication related to output of digital content to the selected wireless output device."

Applicant asserts that neither Atkinson nor ACSDPI teach or describe "receiving over the interface from the user at least an indication related to output of digital content to the selected wireless output device."

Applicant has herein amended independent claim 102 to include at least an analogous limitation as recited by claim 33.

8. Direct wireless connection not including an external server between

Applicant has herein amended claim 1 to further recite "establishing a radio frequency wireless connection directly between the wireless mobile information apparatus and the selected output device for output of digital content directly from the wireless mobile information apparatus to the selected output device, the direct wireless connection not including an external server between the information apparatus and the selected output device."

The Examiner agrees that Atkinson paragraph [0102] is not supported by any applicable Atkinson provisional. According, Atkinson cannot teach nor suggest the above recited limitation.

8.1 Jini

As noted earlier Jini is a network discovery protocol. ACSDPI does not teach or describe the art of "a wireless data output" as recited in each independent claim. Moreover, Jini cannot be use for combining with anything for the following reason.

ACSDPI describes Jini in page 8, paragraph 2-4, passage of which is reproduces below:

> Each Jini device is assumed to have a Java Virtual Machine (JVM) running on it. The Jini architecture principle [9] is similar to that of SLP. Devices and applications register with a Jini network using a process called *Discovery and Join.* To join a Jini network, a device or application places itself into the *Lookup Table* on a lookup server, which is a database for all services on the network (similar to the DA in SLP). Besides pointers to services, the Lookup Table in Jini can also store Java–based program code for these services. This means that services may upload device drivers, an interface, and other programs that help the user to access the service. When

> a client wants to utilize the service, the object code is downloaded from the Lookup Table to the JVM of the client. (ACSDPI page 8 paragraph 2-4)

Applicant asserts that as described by ACSDPI, Jini does not teach or suggest the limitation of "the direct wireless connection not including an external server between the information apparatus and the selected output device." as recited in the claim 1. Instead, ACSDPI teaches the opposite: "to join a Jini network, a device or application places itself into the Lookup Table on a lookup server, which is a database for all services on the network (similar to the DA in SLP)." One skilled in the art will not be motivated to use Jini or combine Jini with ANYTHING to describe each limitation recited in the claims because one skilled in the art will be taught away from "direct wireless connection not including an external server between the information apparatus and the selected output device" as recited by claim 1.

Furthermore, each independent claim recites "Wireless mobile information apparatus" ACSDPI emphasizes that Jini might not be fulfilled in embedded systems:

> On the other hand, the fact that Jini is tightly tied to the programming language Java makes it dependent on the programming environment. It also requires its devices to run a JVM, which consumes memory and processing power. This can be a hard requirement for large device drivers and might not be fulfilled in embedded systems. (ACSDPI page 10, paragraph 2)

Each independent claim recites the element of a "wireless mobile information apparatus." The teachings of ACSDPI using Jini, however, will teach one skilled

in the art away from "wireless mobile information apparatus" that is recited by each independent claim.

Applicant further asserts that any combination including Jini cannot create an expected result including "wireless data output method," "direct wireless connection not including an external server between the information apparatus and the selected output device," and a "mobile information apparatus." Each of these elements recited by the claims constitutes an "unexpected result" from the combination of the Jini protocol with anything.

As with claim 1, Applicant asserts that each independent claim (e.g., 33, 63, 65, 66, 78, 102 and 108) includes an element analogous to a "direct wireless connection not including an external server between the information apparatus and the selected output device," a "mobile information apparatus," and "wireless data output" that are opposite of and contrary to the requirements of the Jini protocol.

9. Receiving over wireless connection information or components for generating output data

In addition to the many distinctions already recited above over the cited prior art references, Applicant has further amended claim 1 to recite "receiving at the wireless mobile information apparatus over the radio frequency wireless communication connection information or components from the selected output device for generating output data."

Neither any Atkinson provisional nor ACSDPI teaches or describes "receiving at the wireless mobile information apparatus over the radio frequency wireless communication connection information or components from the selected output device for generating output data."

Jini is the closest that may describe "receiving component" (ACSDPI, page 6, paragraph 3, driver). However as discussed above, Jini's combination with anything will produce results that are opposite of what is recited in each independent claim.

Examiner further cites Atkinson paragraph [0102]; however as noted, Atkinson paragraph [0102] is not supported by any applicable Atkinson provisional.

Examiner further cites ACSDPI (page 5, paragraph 5, locate service by type, printer, search, choose). Applicant notes that the keyword "locate service by type" is not found in the ACDPI document in entirety. Paragraph 5 is reproduced below for convenience.

> This task is addressed by newly emerging *service discovery protocols*, like SLP (Service Location Protocol), Jini, UPnP (Universal Plug and Play), and Salutation. In a service discovery environment, services advertise themselves, supplying details about their capabilities and information one must know to access the service (e.g., the IP address). Clients (e.g., word processing software) may locate a service by its service type (e.g., printer) and may make an intelligent service selection in case multiple services of the desired type are available. (ACSDPI page 5, paragraph 5)

ACSDPI does not teach nor describe "receiving . . . over the radio frequency wireless" when using SLP, Jini, UPnP, and Salutation. ACSDPI describes these as network service protocols. As an example, ACSDPI teaches

searching for service (e.g. IP address), which is an address of a device in a network.

ACSDPI does not teach nor describe ". . . for generating output data" as recited in claim 1. ACSDPI suggests that information (e.g. an IP address) can be discovered for selection. Accordingly, ACSDPI suggests discovering information for selection and NOT "for generating output data" as recited in the claim 1.

ACSDPI describes Bluetooth as an ad hoc wireless protocol and including a service discovery protocol (SDP) in its protocol stack. ACSDPI describes Bluetooth in page 9, paragraph 4:

> search for services by service type; search for services by service attributes; and service browsing without *a priori* knowledge of the service characteristics. SDP does not include functionality for accessing services. Once services are discovered with SDP, they can be selected, accessed, and used by mechanisms out of the scope of SDP, (ACSDPI, page 9, paragraph 4)

It is well known to one skilled in the art that Bluetooth does not teach nor suggest generating output data. ACSDPI (Bluetooth) does not teach or describe the limitation of "receiving ...components .... for generating output data" as recited in claim 1. Instead, ACSDPI suggests discovering service information for selection. Furthermore, ACSDPI emphasizes that once services are discovered with SDP, they can be selected, accessed, and used by mechanisms out of the scope of SDP.

As with claim 1, Applicant has herein amended each independent claim (e.g., 33, 63, 65, 66, 78, 102 and 108) to include at least an element analogous to "receiving . . . over wireless . . . for generating output data."

10. Being Necessary for Generating

In addition of the above distinctions, Applicant has further amended claim 1 to recite "the information or components being necessary for generating at the wireless mobile information apparatus an accurate output data from the digital content for outputting at the selected output device."

Neither Atkinson nor ACSDPI teaches or describes anything akin to "the information or components being necessary for generating at the wireless mobile information apparatus an accurate output data from the digital content for outputting at the selected output device."

Applicant notes that Bluetooth protocol does not provide or teach "generating at the wireless mobile information apparatus an accurate output data from the digital content."

As with claim 1, Applicant asserts that each independent claim (e.g., 33, 63, 65, 66, 78, 102 and 108) includes at least an element analogous to "receiving . . . being necessary for generating . . . output data."

11. Generating output data using at least partly the information or components

In addition of the above distinctions, Applicant has further amended claim 1 to recite "generating at the wireless mobile information apparatus an accurate output data from the digital content for rendering at the selected output device, using at least partly the information or components received over the wireless communication connection."

As noted, neither Atkinson nor ACSDPI teaches or describes anything akin to "generating . . . output data." Moreover, neither Atkinson nor ACSDPI teaches or suggests "generating at the wireless mobile information apparatus an accurate output data from the digital content for rendering at the selected output device, using at least partly the information or components received over the wireless communication connection."

Applicant asserts that the Bluetooth protocol does not provide or teach "generating at the wireless mobile information apparatus an accurate output data from the digital content." Moreover, the Bluetooth protocol does not provide or teach "generating … using at least partly the information or components received over the wireless communication connection."

As with claim 1, Applicant asserts that each independent claim (e.g., 33, 63, 65, 66, 78, 102 and 108) includes at least an element analogous to generating or conforming digital content to an output data using at least partly the information or components received over the wireless communication connection.

12. Driving

In addition of the above distinctions already discussed, Applicant has herein amended claims 78 and 108 to recite:

> executing at the wireless mobile information apparatus at least part of the one or more components received over the direct wireless connection for driving the output device over the direct wireless connection; and
>
> driving at the wireless mobile information apparatus the output device over the direct wireless connection.

Jini is not applicable to combining for the reasons discussed above. Likewise, Applicant asserts that the Bluetooth protocol does not provide or teach anything akin to the above limitation.

Neither Atkinson nor ACSDPI teaches or describes "executing at the wireless mobile information apparatus at least part of the one or more components received over the direct wireless connection for driving the output device over the direct wireless connection; and driving at the wireless mobile information apparatus the output device over the direct wireless connection."

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claims 1, 33, 63, 65, 66, 78, 102 and 108 recite at least an element not taught or suggested by Atkinson in view ACSDPI either alone or in combination. Accordingly, each independent claim is patentable over Atkinson in view of ACSDPI. Any claims depending from the patentable independent claims 1, 33, 63, 65, 66, 78, 102 and 108 are also patentable at least based on their dependency from a patentable independent claim. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that claims 1, 3-9, 11, 12, 14-21, 23-25, 28-31, 33, 35-41, 43-49, 51, 53-66, 69-78, 80-90, 92-93, and 95-113 are patentable.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (360) 750-9931 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case. The Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of the pending claims must be withdrawn, and that this application is in condition for allowance. Such is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jon C. Reali/

JON C. REALI
USPTO Reg. No. 54,391

RYLANDER & ASSOCIATES PC
406 West 12th Street
Vancouver, Washington 98660
(360) 750-9931